



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## AMERICAN ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT BOSTON, MASS.

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD . . . . . EDITOR.

## TWO KINDS OF PEACE MEN.

In speaking of the peace party, Kate Gannett Wells in the last number of the *ADVOCATE* made use of a sentence which many of the readers of the journal may have noticed. It was this: "It has deprecated war in the abstract, and justified particular wars." Is this true? Has the peace party been guilty of this inconsistency? At first thought one is inclined to deny it outright, and say that no such thing can possibly be. But it is true, nevertheless. There are two distinct sections of the peace party, as it now exists. The one part believe that all war is wrong. To them it is inhuman, in the fundamental sense of that term. From the standpoint of reason, no justifiable grounds can be given for its existence. It is forbidden by both the spirit and the letter of the Gospel of Christ, and no Christian can possibly participate in any war without violating the most fundamental and essential principles of his profession. There was a time when the peace party, if that is a suitable name for what then existed, was composed wholly of this class of men and women. The peace movement of this century originated with such. They founded the London Peace Society early in the century, and to a large extent have controlled it ever since. Nearly all of the peace societies in America, in the early part of the century, out of which the American Peace Society grew, were founded and maintained by this class of persons. They have always constituted the backbone of the movement; they must always do so. They can always be relied upon in times of storm and stress, as well as in times of calm. It would be invidious to make mention of names in this connection, but they will occur readily to any one acquainted with the history of the cause.

Is it an evidence of the growing strength, or of an increasing weakness of the cause, that it has now gathered about it another class of persons, more numerous perhaps than the former? We think decidedly the former. We heartily wish that all peace workers believed in "peace at any price;" that is, that all war, offensive and defensive alike, is wrong, and hence that a peace man cannot have any part in it, whatever his refusal to do so may cost him. It seems to us that that is what it takes to make a complete, unmistakable peace man. But we do not doubt the sincerity and honesty of those constituting the other wing of the party. Many of them believe that war is allowable in supposable cases of self-defence. How many of them will justify the next war, in case their own country should be a party to it, we have no means of

knowing. We fear that what Mrs. Wells says might be true of many of them, and that this would greatly cripple and retard the peace movement. But their efforts to remove international misunderstandings and to assist in bringing into existence a high court of nations cannot be without beneficial influence. They look upon war as such an expensive and awfully destructive method of settling difficulties, even in the few cases in which they might grant it to be lawful, that they think every possible means ought to be used to eradicate its causes and prevent its recurrence. Many of them will take higher ground than this as the work goes on. In this connection, it is no treason to the cause to say that peace, even for policy's sake, is infinitely better than war. If all men, who pretend to be lovers of good and of human progress, would go even as far as these men do, no more wars would be possible. How any Christian can occupy a ground lower than these men take, is to us absolutely inexplicable. We are in total darkness how to account for even the indifference on the subject of any one calling himself by a name derived from that of the Prince of Peace.

## MILITARY IMMORALITY AND CRUELTY.

Two events took place during the Homestead troubles, one of which has awakened widespread disapproval and even indignation, while the other, no less significant in its way, was passed over with scarcely a comment. Both of these are fine samples of the way in which war is becoming *civilized*. It may not seem very appropriate to use the term war in reference to the Homestead affair, but as the military was there, under orders from the State, even though they did no fighting, it is perfectly fair to speak of the two events about to be mentioned as fair illustrations of the legitimate fruit of the war system.

When the troops first arrived upon the scene, or rather just before, it was night. "They had forgotten to take bread." Halting by a farmer's premises they proceeded unceremoniously to empty an immense potato patch and cook and eat the potatoes, leaving the old man none. They milked his cows, they carried off and ate his chickens, except an old rooster or two. When the farmer came out in the morning and saw the situation he was much annoyed and began to use such terms as "scoundrels," "sneak thieves," etc. The interview between him and the officers need not be repeated, except to say that they advised him to put in a bill to the State and be sure to make it large enough. The whole thing was treated by the officers and by the newspaper reporters as a huge joke, "awfully funny." We do not remember to have seen a single line of disapproval in any of the ordinary newspapers.

These soldier "boys" who did this pillaging would, almost without exception, scorn to do such a thing when